Patent Application
Docket No. P14984US

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for his report. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1 - 22 are currently pending in the application. Claims 2, 8-11 and 17-22 are hereby cancelled without prejudice to the Applicants. **Claims 1, 3-7 and 12-16** remain under examination.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to. A replacement abstract is hereby provided to overcome the objection. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection of the specification is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim objections

Claims 9, **13** and 17 are objected to. Since claims 9 and 17 are cancelled, they will not be further discussed. Claim 13 is objected since a "period" was missing at the end of the claim. The informality is now corrected. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to claim 13 is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C § 101

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claim 2 is cancelled and will not be further discussed. Claim 1 is amended and now related to a network node. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 101 is hereby respectfully requested.

Claims 3 - 7 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claim 3 - 7 are amended and now depend on claim 1, which relates to a network node. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 - 7 under 35 U.S.C § 101 is hereby respectfully requested.

Claims 20 - 22 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claims 20 - 22 are cancelled and will not be further discussed.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3 and 5-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rawlings et al. (US 2002/0194369) herein referred to as Rawlings. Claims 2, 8-11 and 17-19 are cancelled and will not be further discussed. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 12-16. Claims 1 and 12 are independent claims.

The Applicants note that claim 4 is not rejected neither under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) or 35 U.S.C § 103(a). In order to expedite prosecution, limitations substantially corresponding thereto are now incorporated in claim 1. Furthermore, for clarity purposes and still with hopes of expediting prosecution, further limitations on the capabilities of the network node of claim 1 are added.

Claim 1 now relates to a network node in an Internet Protocol (IP) network comprising a table. The table comprises a plurality of records, each associating at least two Policy Enforcement Points (PEP) with a range of IP addresses. The network node of claim 1 is capable of, with a specific IP address, finding one of the plurality of records from the table corresponding to the specific IP address. In such a case, the corresponding record is located since the specific IP address is within the range of IP addresses thereof. The network node is further capable of reading a first one of the at least two PEPs in the corresponding record and sending policy information to the first PEP. Upon reception of an indication that the first PEP is not working, the network node is further capable of reading a second one of the at least two PEPs in the corresponding record and sending policy information to the second PEP.

Rawlings relates to policy-based synchronization of per-class resources between routers in a data network. It mentions an Edge Point Identification Table 286 listing records associating an edge node with a range of IP addresses (page 8, paragraph 129). Rawlings further notes that the records may be initially provided or learned locally (page 8, paragraph 129). Paragraph 78 on page 6 further specifies that the Edge Point Identification Table 286 is installed (or pushed) by a PDP into an Edge Point Identification Table 252 maintained in the edge node. The table 252 specifies one or more ranges of destination IP addresses for which a specific edge node is the receiving

edge router. The table is used to determine, based on the IP address, if received traffic needs to be shaped according to policies already present in the receiving edge router.

As it was already appreciated by the Examiner, Rawlings does not associates multiple nodes with a range of IP addresses. Furthermore, the table of Rawlings do not have the same purpose of identifying more than one PEP for a range of IP addresses. The newly added limitations relating to the capabilities of the network node are also absent from Rawlings.

Patentability of **claims 3 and 5-7** ultimately depends on claim 1. Therefore, and in view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, 3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 12 is amended for clarity purposes and with hopes of expediting prosecution.

Claim 12 now relates to a method for updating a table of data records, wherein each of the data records associates an Internet Protocol (IP) address range with a first Policy Enforcement Point (PEP) and a second PEP. The table of data record resides in a network node. The method comprises steps of receiving, from a PEP, routing information in the network node. Upon reception of the routing information at the network node, the method follows by extracting, from the routing information, the IP addresses assigned to the PEP and comparing the received routing information with information stored in at least one data record. In such a case, the at least one data record has at least one of the PEP and the IP addresses listed therein. Thereafter, if needed, the method follows with updating the at least one data record.

Rawlings has already been discussed. With relation to claim 12, it can be restated that Rawlings notes that the records of the table 286 in the PDP may be initially provided or learned locally (page 8, paragraph 129).

As was previously mentioned, the table of Rawlings do not have the same purpose of identifying more than one PEP for a range of IP addresses. Furthermore, Rawlings does not teach how to update records in a table. It simply mentions that the table can be learned locally if not initially provided. The learning or provision of the table is done

upon creation of the table rather than during its lifetime. Rawlings does not give technical details on the way the table could be updated.

Patentability of **claims 13-16** ultimately depends on claim 12. Therefore , and in view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12-16 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

Claims 20 - 22 are under 35 U.S.C § 103(1) as being unpatentable over Rawlings in view of Ebata et al (US 6,708,209) hereinafter referred to as Ebata. Claims 20 - 22 are cancelled and will not be further discussed.

Even though Ebata is not used to reject any pending claims, the Applicants took the reference into account while preparing the amended set of claims. More precisely, it can be noted that Fig 4 of Ebata presents a table similar to what is described in the background section of the pending application wherein one policy server (50003) is associated with IP addresses (50005, 50006). Search/update units are present in Ebata, but none of them relates to updating records in a table identifying more than one PEP for a range of IP addresses.

Patent Application
Docket No. P14984US

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for favourable action.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the present amendment or present patent application, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (514) 345-7900 ext. 2596.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 06, 2005

Alex Nicolaescu
Reg. No. 47,253